

1

or disregard any information submitted by Mr. Edelman.¹ Rather, she simply disagreed with his legal position and concluded that he had not met his burden of proving that the State or county election officials had violated HAVA.

Mr. Edelman argues that the ALJ misinterpreted the Secretary's duties under HAVA and that the Secretary has a duty to <u>prevent</u> underage applicants from being placed on the voter database. Appeal at p. 1, third paragraph. However, HAVA does not use the term "prevent," and the section of HAVA that Mr. Edelman relies on for this—that the voter database is to be accurate—must be read in its entirety. That section goes on to state that the State official's duty is to "make[] a reasonable effort to <u>remove</u> registrants who are ineligible to vote" 42 U.S.C. § 15483(a)(4)(A)(emphasis added). Thus, HAVA itself recognizes that registrants who are ineligible may inadvertently get onto the voter database. The ALJ did not err in concluding that the State was making a reasonable effort to remove ineligible voters and that Mr. Edelman had not met his burden in showing a violation of this provision.

Mr. Edelman's proposed remedy of having State and county elections officials reject or return voter registration forms from underage applicants, rather than pend them, would result in needless confusion to applicants and would likely discourage some potentially eligible voters from registering in time to vote. Both HAVA and state law (and Mr. Edelman himself) recognize that individuals can legally register to vote prior to their 18th birthday. Not all 17-year old applicants will know when the next election is. Under Mr. Edelman's

¹ To the extent that Mr. Edelman's appeal can be characterized as taking exception to any of the ALJ's findings of fact, such exceptions are misplaced. For example, Mr. Edelman states that the ALJ erroneously concluded that the practice of pending underage registration forms has prevented any underage voters from actually being placed on the statewide voter database. Appeal at p. 2, top paragraph. The ALJ did not say this. The ALJ recognized that some underage voters have been erroneously placed on the database and that a few had actually cast ballots. See Initial Decision at ¶ 3.9. What the ALJ actually said was that the practice of pending such voter application forms is not intended to result in underage applicants showing up as eligible voters. See Initial Decision at ¶ 4.3.

approach, a county would have to reject or return a voter registration form, even though the applicant might become eligible just a few days later. Mr. Edelman's approach is overly bureaucratic and is at odds with the overall goal of encouraging citizens to register to vote. The ALJ correctly concluded that nothing in HAVA precluded the present practice of pending such application forms until the applicant reaches the required age.

In his appeal, Mr. Edelman argues that the steps necessary to prevent the registration of underage voters "are simple to carry out." Appeal at p. 1, third paragraph. However, Mr. Edelman's requested remedies, such as rejecting or returning application forms, present their own problems as just discussed. In addition, changes to the way the voter database is configured or adding direct controls at the state level could be expensive and inconsistent with the premise under both HAVA and state law that the initial responsibility for voter registration lies with the counties.

HAVA expressly provides: "The specific choices on the methods of complying with the requirements of this title shall be left to the discretion of the State." 42 U.S.C. § 15485. The statewide voter database has only been in place since January 2006. The Elections Division staff continues to work with the counties to improve the operation of the database. Mr. Edelman and other interested individuals and groups are certainly encouraged to make suggestions for improving the system and to point out specific irregularities in the information in the database. Ultimately, however, in the absence of a HAVA violation, the determination of how to best comply with HAVA is entrusted to the State.

1	The ALJ correctly concluded that Mr. Edelman had not met his burden of proving a
2	HAVA violation, and the Secretary should affirm the ALJ's decision dismissing his
3	complaint.
4	DATED this 11th day of September, 2008.
5	ROBERT M. MCKENNA
6	Attorney General
7	Sponer W. Daniels
8	SPENCER W. DANIELS Assistant Attorney General
9	Assistant Attorney General WSBA No. 6831
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	,
23	
24	
25	
26	

1	PROOF OF SERVICE
2	I certify that I served a copy of this document on all parties or their counsel of record
3	on the date below as follows:
4	☐ US Mail Postage/Prepaid via Consolidated Mail Service and Electronic Mail to:
5	Mr. Jonathan Bechtle
6	Evergreen Freedom Foundation PO Box 552
7 8	Olympia, WA 98507 jbechtle@effwa.org
9	I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of Washington that the
10	foregoing is true and correct.
11 12	DATED this 11th day of September, 2008, at Olympia, WA.
13	Canarala
14	COURTNEY AMIDON Legal Assistant
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	·
21	
22	
23 24	
24 25	
36	